Pis'ma v ZhETF

Threshold Perturbations in Current-Carrying Superconducting Bridges with a Finite Length near the Critical Temperature

P. M. Marychev[1)] *and D. Yu. Vodolazov*

Institute for Physics of Microstructures, Russian Academy of Sciences, Nizhny Novgorod, 603950 Russia

Submitted January 26, 2016

Resubmitted February 15, 2016

arXiv:1605.05958v2 [cond-mat.supr-con] 7 Jun 2016

Near the critical temperature of a superconducting transition, the energy of the threshold perturbation δF_{thr} that transfers a superconducting bridge to a resistive state at a current below the critical current I_c has been determined. It has been shown that δF_{thr} increases with a decrease in the length of a bridge for short bridges with lengths $L < \xi$ (where ξ is the coherence length) and is saturated for long bridges with $L \gg \xi$. At certain geometrical parameters of banks and bridge, the function $\delta F_{thr}(L)$ at the current $I \to 0$ has a minimum at $L \sim 2 - 3\xi$. These results indicate that the effect of fluctuations on Josephson junctions made in the form of short superconducting bridges is reduced and that the effect of fluctuations on bridges with lengths $\sim 2 - 3\xi$ is enhanced.

It is known that a superconducting state becomes unstable with respect to infinitely small perturbations of the superconducting order parameter Δ when the current I flowing in a superconductor is larger than a certain critical value, $I > I_c$. However, switching to a resistive state can occur at a lower current if the appearance of a finite perturbation in the system is possible. This effect is well known from the theory of Josephson junctions [1]. Such a switching in superconducting bridges/wires with a finite length L was studied experimentally in [2, 3]. These perturbations are due to thermal or quantum fluctuations. If fluctuation- induced change in the order parameter Δ is small, the superconducting system returns to the equilibrium state without dissipation. However, if this change in Δ is sufficiently large, instability will be developed in the superconductor, leading to the appearance of a finite resistance and dissipation. As a result, in the presence of a sufficiently high current, the superconductor can be heated and switched to the normal state. If the energy of threshold perturbation δF_{thr} is much higher than the thermal energy k_BT, the probability of the appearance of such a perturbation owing to thermal fluctuation is determined primarily by the Arrhenius factor $exp(-\delta F_{thr}/k_BT)$.

It will be shown below that threshold perturbation δF_{thr} in bridges with the length $L < \xi$ increases rapidly with a decrease in L because of enhanced suppression of superconductivity in banks. For this reason, Josephson junctions based on short bridges/constrictions are more stable with respect to fluctuations at a decrease in the length of the bridge/constriction. At the same time, small δF_{thr} is necessary in some other situations. In particular, this is important when studying macroscopic quantum tunneling in superconducting systems [4]. As will be shown below, sufficiently narrow bridges with a length of about 2-3ξ have the minimum δF_{thr}. Consequently, they are more preferable as compared to shorter or longer bridges for their use in devices based on quantum tunneling between different states (e.g., so-called flux qubits [5]).

To calculate threshold perturbation, it is necessary to determine a saddle-point state in the system nearest in energy to the ground state. For a long ($L \gg \xi$, where ξ is the coherence length) one-dimensional (transverse dimensions smaller than ξ) superconducting bridge, such a problem was solved in well-known work [6]. It was found that threshold perturbation (saddle state) corresponds to a partial suppression of the superconducting order parameter in a finite segment of the bridge with dimensions of about ξ, and the amplitude of suppression increases with a decrease in the flowing current. Langer and Ambegaokar [6] obtained the dependence of the energy of threshold perturbation on the applied current. It is described well by the expression [7]

$$\delta F_{LA} = \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{3} F_0 \left(1 - \frac{I}{I_{dep}}\right)^{5/4} = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{2} \frac{I_{dep}\hbar}{e} \left(1 - \frac{I}{I_{dep}}\right)^{5/4}, \quad (1)$$

where $F_0 = \Phi_0^2 S/32\pi^3\lambda^2\xi$, Φ_0 is the magnetic flux quantum, $S = wd$ is the area of the cross section of the bridge with the width w and thickness d, λ is the London penetration depth of the magnetic field, and $I_{dep} = 2I_0/3\sqrt{3}$ ($I_0 = c\Phi_0 S/8\pi^2\lambda^2\xi$) is the depairing current in the

[1)]e-mail: observermp@yandex.ru

Ginzburg–Landau model, which coincides with the expected critical current of the long ($L \gg \xi$) bridge.

We calculate the energy of threshold perturbation for the superconducting bridge with an arbitrary length L, which can be both smaller and larger than ξ. This problem is of interest because of the development of technologies and the appearance of superconducting bridges with a length of about the coherence length [2, 3, 8]. As in [6], we use the Ginzburg–Landau model; therefore, our results are applicable only near T_c. We find that the current dependence of δF_{thr} varies smoothly from (1) for bridges with the length $L \gg \xi$ to the expression $\delta F_{thr} = \hbar I_c(1 - I/I_c)^{3/2}/e$ for bridges with the length $L \ll \xi$, where $I_c = I_0\xi/L$ is the critical current of the short bridge [9]. In the latter case, the current dependence of $F_{thr}(I)$ coincides with the known result for Josephson junctions with a sinusoidal current-phase relation [1], where I_c is the critical current of the junction. Furthermore, we found that the suppression of the superconducting order parameter in banks of short bridges is of great importance: it is responsible for the dependence of δF_{thr} on the length of the bridge and the width of banks. In the onedimensional model, we obtained the dependence $\delta F_{thr}(I = 0) \sim 1/L$ for a short bridge with $L < \xi$. In the two-dimensional model, we found a region of the parameters where $\delta F_{thr}(I = 0)$ depends nonmonotonically on the length of the bridge and reaches a minimum at $L \sim 2 - 3\xi$. Our results can be used to analyze experimental data on the switching current of short superconducting bridges/wires and fluctuation resistance of bridges at temperatures near T_c.

We consider a model system consisting of the superconducting bridge with the area of cross section S and length L, which connects two superconducting banks whose cross section has the area S_{pad} (Fig. 1). To determine the energy of threshold perturbation transferring the superconducting bridge to the resistive state, we use the Ginzburg - Landau model. To determine δF_{thr}, it is necessary to find the state of the system corresponding to the local minimum (extremum) of the free energy. The saddle-point state, as well as the ground state, can be found from the solution of the Ginzburg - Landau equation:

$$\xi_{GL}^2(0)\nabla^2\Delta + (1 - T/T_c - |\Delta|^2/\Delta_{GL}^2(0))\Delta = 0, \quad (2)$$

where $\xi_{GL}(0)$ and $\Delta_{GL}(0)$ – are the coherence length and superconducting order parameter in the Ginzburg - Landau model at zero temperature [10].

For the superconducting system (see 1) with the maximum characteristic transverse dimension $d_{pad} \sim \sqrt{S_{pad}} \ll \xi$, the problem can be considered as one-



Fig. 1. Superconducting bridge with the area of cross section S and length Lconnecting superconducting banks with the area of cross section S_{pad}.

dimensional and only the dependence on the longitudinal coordinate x is taken into account. In this case, the dimensionless Ginzburg – Landau equation has the form (the solution is sought in the form $\Delta(x)/\Delta_{GL} = f(x)exp(i\varphi(x))$)

$$\frac{d^2f}{dx^2} - \frac{j^2}{f^3} + f - f^3 = 0, \quad (3)$$

where the condition of the constant current in the system, $I = const$, is used (here, $j = f^2 d\varphi/dx = I/S$ is the current density in the bridge and $j = I/S_{pad} < I/S$ is the current density in banks). In (3), the magnitude of the superconducting order parameter f, length, and current density are measured in units of $\Delta_{GL} = \Delta_{GL}(0)\sqrt{1 - T/T_c}$, $\xi = \xi_{GL}(0)/\sqrt{1 - T/T_c}$, and I_0/S, respectively.

Equation (3) should be supplemented with boundary conditions at the ends of the bridge:

$$\left.\frac{df^L}{dx}\right|_{-\frac{L}{2}} = \left.\frac{S}{S_{pad}}\frac{df^C}{dx}\right|_{-\frac{L}{2}} = \left.\frac{S}{S_{pad}}\frac{df^C}{dx}\right|_{\frac{L}{2}} = \left.\frac{df^R}{dx}\right|_{\frac{L}{2}}, \quad (4a)$$

$$f^L\big|_{-\frac{L}{2}} = f^C\big|_{-\frac{L}{2}} = f^C\big|_{\frac{L}{2}} = f^R\big|_{\frac{L}{2}}, \quad (4b)$$

$$f^L\big|_{-\frac{L_{sys}}{2}} = f^R\big|_{\frac{L_{sys}}{2}} = 1, \quad (4c)$$

where f^L, f^C and f^R are the magnitudes of the order parameter in the left bank, bridge, and right bank, respectively.

Condition (4a) appears from the variation of the Ginzburg - Landau functional for the superconductor with the cross section depending on x (which is responsible for the appearance of the derivative $d/dx(S(x)df/dx)$] in the Ginzburg - Landau equation). This condition is exact in the case of a continuous change in S slow at the scale ξ, where the dependence of f on the transverse coordinate can be neglected. In our model, this change is stepwise. Consequently, the ratio S/S_{pad} here is not the actual ratio of the areas of the cross sections but is a reference parameter characterizing a change in the derivative of the function f in the x direction at the transition through the bank - bridge interface. We also assume that the entire system is connected to wider banks (located at $x = \pm L_{sys}/2$)),

where the current density is almost zero and the order parameter reaches its equilibrium value $f = 1$. In order to exclude the effect of these banks on the transport characteristics of the bridge, we set $L_{sys} - L = 20\xi$ in numerical calculations. The energy of threshold perturbation can be determined using the expression

$$\frac{\delta F_{thr}}{F_0} = F_{saddle} - F_{ground} - 2\frac{I}{I_0}\delta\varphi, \qquad (5)$$

where $\delta\varphi$ is the additional phase difference between the ends of the bridge appearing in the saddle-point state and F_{saddle} and F_{ground} are the dimensionless free energies of the saddle-point and ground states, respectively:

$$F_{saddle,ground} = -\frac{1}{2}\int f^4 dx. \qquad (6)$$

Equation (3) with boundary conditions (4) was solved numerically for arbitrary L values and analytically in the limit $L \ll \xi$. In the numerical solution, we used the relaxation method: the time derivative $\partial f/\partial t$ was added to Ginzburg – Landau equation (3) and iterations were performed until the time derivative became zero within a given accuracy. To find the saddle- point state, we used the numerical method proposed in [11]: at a given current, we fixed the magnitude of the order parameter $f(0)$ in the center of the bridge, allowing variations of f at all other points. The state with the minimum fixed $f(0)$ value for which a steady-state solution exists is a saddle-point state. In the case of long bridges, this numerical method gives δF_{thr} values coinciding with Eq. (1).

To analytically find the energy of the saddle-point state, we take into account that the order parameter varies rapidly at scales much smaller than ξ. Therefore, the linear and cubic terms can be neglected in Eq. (3) for a short bridge. In this case, we arrive at the equation

$$\frac{d^2 f}{dx^2} - \frac{j^2}{f^3} = 0, \qquad (7)$$

which has the first integral

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{df}{dx}\right)^2 + \frac{j^2}{2f^2} = E, \qquad (8)$$

and the solution

$$x = \frac{1}{2}\int_{u_1}^{u} \frac{du}{\sqrt{2Eu - j^2}} = \qquad (9)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E}}\left(\sqrt{u - \frac{j^2}{2E}} - \sqrt{u(0) - \frac{j^2}{2E}}\right).$$

Here, $u(x) = f^2(x)$. Owing to the symmetry of the system, $\left.\frac{du}{dx}\right|_{x=0} = 0$. At this step, we assume that variations of f are small in banks and use the boundary condition $u(L/2) = u(-L/2) = 1$ to find the constant E:

$$f = \sqrt{2E_{\pm}x^2 + \frac{j^2}{2E_{\pm}}}, \qquad (10)$$

$$E_{\pm} = \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{I}{I_c}\right)^2}}{L^2}, \qquad (11)$$

where E_+ and E_- correspond to the saddle-point and ground states, respectively, and I_c is the critical current of the short bridge [9].

It is fundamentally important to take into account change in Δ in the banks when determining the energy of the saddle-point state in the case of short bridges. Otherwise, fixing Δ in the banks, as in the problem of the critical current of bridges [9], one can find (from solutions presented below; see Eq. (15)) that the energy of the saddle-point state is negative in a wide range of the current $I < I_c$.



Fig. 2. Current dependences of the energy of threshold perturbation for bridges with different lengths at the ratio of areas $S_{pad}/S = 100$. The dashed lines correspond to numerical calculations and the solid lines are obtained from Eq. (1) for a bridge with the length $L = 4\xi$ and from Eq. (15) for bridges with $L = \xi$ and $\xi/2$.

We seek the solution in the banks in the form $f = 1 - f_1$, where $f_1 \ll 1$, and neglect the depairing effect of the current. Then, Eq. (3) for f_1 in the range $|x| > L/2$ becomes

$$\frac{d^2 f_1}{dx^2} - 2f_1 = 0. \qquad (12)$$

with the solution

$$f_1 = Ce^{\pm\sqrt{2}(x \pm L/2)}, \qquad (13)$$

where the signs + and − correspond to the left and right banks, respectively. The constant C is determined from boundary conditions (4). When the current density in the banks is $j \ll 1$ and the ratio of the cross sections is $S/S_{pad} \ll 1$, Eq. (10) can be used for f and the constant C is determined as

$$C = \frac{S}{S_{pad}}\sqrt{E_{\pm} - \frac{j^2}{2}}. \qquad (14)$$

Taking into account a decrease in the order parameter in the banks in Eq. (6), we obtain the following expression for the energy of threshold perturbation:

$$\frac{\delta F_{thr}}{F_0} = 2\sqrt{2}\frac{\xi}{L}\left(\sqrt{1+\sqrt{1-\gamma^2}-\frac{\gamma^2}{2}}- \right.$$
$$\left. -\sqrt{1-\sqrt{1-\gamma^2}-\frac{\gamma^2}{2}}\right) + \frac{2}{5}\frac{L}{\xi}\sqrt{1-\gamma^2} -$$
$$-4\gamma\frac{\xi}{L}\arccos(\gamma), \qquad (15)$$

where $\gamma = I/I_c$. If a decrease in Δ in the banks is disregarded, the first term in Eq. (15) is absent and $\delta F_{thr} < 0$ is in a wide range of currents.

Figure 2 shows the results of the numerical calculation δF_{thr} for bridges with different lengths in comparison with the results obtained by expressions (1) and (15). It is seen that δF_{thr} for a bridge with the length $L = 4\xi$ is well reproduced by Eq. (1), whereas Eq. (15) almost exactly reproduces the numerical results for the bridge with the length $L = \xi$. Expression (15) for short bridges with lengths $L \ll \xi$ is close to the approximation expression

$$\delta F_{thr} = \frac{4\xi}{L}F_0(1-I/I_c)^{3/2} = \frac{I_c\hbar}{e}(1-I/I_c)^{3/2} \qquad (16)$$

which coincides with the known result [1] following from the theory of Josephson junctions with the sinusoidal currentphase relation if I_c is treated as the critical current of a Josephson junction.

Expression (15) was obtained under the assumption that $C \ll 1$ and $f_1 \ll 1$, which are ensured by the condition

$$\frac{S}{S_{pad}}\frac{\xi}{L} \ll 1. \qquad (17)$$

Our numerical calculations show that the current dependence of the ratio $\delta F_{thr}(I/I_c)/\delta F_{thr}(0)$ varies slightly and is determined primarily by the length of the bridge even when condition(17) is invalid and $\delta F_{thr}(0)$ depends on the ratio S_{pad}/S (see inset in Fig. 3).

If Eq. (15) is formally used for bridges with an arbitrary length, the dependence $\delta F_{thr}(L)$ at $I \to 0$ has the form

$$\frac{\delta F_{thr}}{F_0}(I \to 0) = \frac{4\xi}{L} + \frac{2L}{5\xi}. \qquad (18)$$



Fig. 3. Energy of threshold perturbation versus the length of the bridge in the limit $I \to 0$ at $S_{pad}/S = 100$. The closed squares are the results of the numerical calculations and the line corresponds to (18). The inset shows $\delta F_{thr}(0)$ versus S_{pad}/S for bridges with different lengths (onedimensional model).

According to Eq. (18), δF_{thr} should have a minimum at $L = \sqrt{10}\xi \simeq 3\xi$. However, numerical calculations within the one-dimensional model do not confirm this result (see Fig. 3). With an increase in the length of the bridge, δF_{thr} decreases monotonically, approaching the known value $\delta F_{thr}(0)/F_0 = 4\sqrt{2}/3 \simeq 1.89$ at $L \gg \xi$ (see Eq. (1)).

However, the sizes of the bridge and banks at which the dependence $\delta F_{thr}(L)$ at $I \to 0$ is nonmonotonic can be found beyond the one-dimensional model. To this end, we considered a two-dimensional model system shown in Fig. 4. This model implies the numerical solution of the two-dimensional Ginzburg.Landau equation

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2} + f - f^3 = 0, \qquad (19)$$

with fixed $f(x = \pm L_{sys}/2, y) = 1$, normal derivative $\partial f/\partial n = 0$ at the other edges of the superconducting system, and additional condition $f(x = 0, y) = 0$ (see Fig. 4) corresponding to the saddle-point state at $I \to 0$.

We considered various w_{pad}, w, and L. It is seen in Fig. 5 that the dependence $\delta F_{thr}(L)$ at a sufficiently small width of the bridge ($w = \xi/5$ for the parameters under consideration) has a minimum at $L \simeq 2 - 3\xi$.

We also analyzed the dependence of $\delta F_{thr}(0)$ on the width of the banks in the two-dimensional model (the data are shown in Fig. 6). As in the one-dimensional model, the energy of threshold perturbation becomes independent of the ratio w_{pad}/w when the width of the bridge becomes much smaller than w_{pad}. However, for



Fig. 4. Two-dimensional superconducting bridge with the length L and width w with banks of the width w_{pad}. The thicknesses of the bridge and banks coincide with each other; $L_{sys} - L = 6$.



Fig. 5. Energy of threshold perturbation versus the length of the bridge in the limit $I \to 0$ at different widths of the bridge and banks calculated within the two-dimensional model. The thicknesses of the bridge and banks coincide with each other.

the chosen geometry (see Fig. 4), saturation occurs at smaller w_{pad}/w values (cf. inset in Fig. 3).

Using the reasons of Little [8, 12], we can estimate a finite (owing to thermal fluctuations) resistance of the short bridge R at low currents by the expression

$$R = R_n exp\left(-\frac{\delta F_{thr}(0)}{k_B T}\right) = R_n exp\left(-\frac{I_0 \hbar}{e k_B T}\frac{\xi}{L}\right) \quad (20)$$
$$= R_n exp\left(-\frac{R_q}{R_n}\frac{2.66\Delta(0)}{k_B T}\left(1-\frac{T}{T_c}\right)\right),$$

where R_n is the resistance of the bridge in the normal state, $R_q = \pi\hbar/2e^2$ is the resistance quantum and $\delta F_{thr}(0)$ is given by Eq. (16). According to Eq. (20), R decreases exponentially with a decrease in the length of the bridge. This effect is due to the suppression of Δ in the banks in the saddle-point state, which is stronger for a shorter bridge. Thus, the banks are responsible for a decrease in R, but only for a sufficiently short bridge with $L < \xi$. In the case of a long bridge, the banks either do not affect the resistance of the bridge or increase it. The latter effect is possible only for sufficiently narrow bridges (see Fig. 5), for which a decrease in δF_{thr} owing to a decrease in the length of the bridge is not compensated by an increase in δF_{thr}, which is due to the suppression of Δ in banks.



Fig. 6. Energy of threshold perturbation at zero current calculated for the bridge with the length $L = 0.6\xi$ within the two-dimensional model for different widths of the bridge and banks.

It is worth noting that the fluctuation resistance of the bridge depends strongly not only on its length but also on the size of the banks in view of the dependence of $\delta F_{thr}(0)$ on S_{pad}/S (see inset in Fig. 3 and Fig. 6). The critical current depends also on the ratio S_{pad}/S. In particular, within the one-dimensional model, it is easy to show that

$$I_c = I_0 \frac{\xi}{L}\left(1 - \sqrt{2}\frac{S}{S_{pad}}\frac{\xi}{L}\right) \quad (21)$$

under condition (17). However, since $\delta F_{thr}(0)$ appears in Eq. (20) in the exponential, variations of the size of the banks affect the fluctuation resistance R more strongly than its critical current.

This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project no. 15-42-02365).

1. T. Fulton and L. N. Dunkleberger, Phys. Rev. B, **9**, 4760 (1974).
2. M. Sahu, M. H. Bae, A. Rogachev, D. Pekker, T.C. Wei, N. Shah, P. M. Goldbart, and A. Bezryadin, Nature Phys., **5**, 503 (2009).
3. P. Li, P. M. Wu, Y. Bomze, I. V. Borzenets, G. Finkelstein, and A. M. Chang, Phys. Rev. Lett., **107**, 137004 (2011).
4. K.Yu. Arutyunov, D.S. Golubev, A.D. Zaikin, Physics Reports 464, 1 (2008).

5. J.E. Mooij, C.J.P.M. Harmans, New Journal of Physics **7**, 219 (2005).
6. J.S. Langer and V. Ambegaokar, Phys. Rev. **164**, 498 (1967).
7. M. Tinkham, J. U. Free, C. N. Lau, N. Markovic, Phys. Rev. B, **68**, 134515 (2003).
8. Sang L. Chu, A. T. Bollinger, and A. Bezryadin, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 214506 (2004).
9. L. G. Aslamazov and A. I. Larkin, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. Pis. Red. 9, 150 A968); transl. JETP Lett. **9**, 87 (1969).
10. M. Tinkham, *Introduction to superconductivity*, (2ed, McGraw-Hill, NY, 1996).
11. D. Yu. Vodolazov, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 174507 (2012).
12. W.A. Little, Phys. Rev. 156, 396 (1967).